

Over the \mathbb{D}

Hypersurreal • 3 Dec 2023

$$\mathbb{D}^\circ = \mathbb{D}$$

Welp.. I think I've officially gone *loony*! 😄

I can't stop thinking about *the moon*.. I learned about \odot (sunny) & \mathbb{D} (loony) at the same time:

$$\odot = \{0^*, 1^*, 2^*, 3^*, \dots\}$$

$$\mathbb{D} + 0 = \mathbb{D} + *1 = \mathbb{D} + *2 = \dots = \mathbb{D} + \mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}$$

The interesting thing to me is that since $\mathbb{D} + n = \mathbb{D}$ we have $\mathbb{D} + \odot = \mathbb{D}$. It may not be *that* interesting, but I think it's a beautiful equation.

Additionally, we have $\mathbb{D}n = \mathbb{D}$, which leads to another beautiful equation:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\mathbb{D}} = \mathbb{D}$$

A part of what has me in *lunatic* mode are 2 papers I recently found:

- [Impartial games with entailing moves](#)
- [A complete solution for a nontrivial ruleset with entailing moves](#)

In the first paper the authors introduce **affine** impartial / normal play games.

While most of the paper is above my head, it did inspire an idea!

Can ∞ in affine impartial ($\mathbb{I}m^\infty$) & normal play ($\mathbb{N}p^\infty$) be replaced w/ *on* to form $\mathbb{I}m^{on}$ & $\mathbb{N}p^{on}$?

Affine games do not include transfinite numbers (but they can produce infinitely many finite numbers). I think replacing ∞ w/ *on* would result in a class of games that does include transfinite numbers. I'm just not sure what, if anything, would break..

My basic line of thinking of why this might work is:

- $on = \{on|\} \in \mathcal{L}$ (right has no moves & left can pass) (1.1)
- $off = \{|\} \in \mathcal{R}$ (left has no moves & right can pass) (1.2)
- $\forall x \in \mathbb{I}m^{on} \setminus \{off\}, on + x = on$ (1.3)
- $\forall x \in \mathbb{I}m^{on} \setminus \{on\}, off + x = off$ (1.4)
- $on + off = dud$ (1.5)

$$\bullet 0 = \{off|on\}$$

I'm not sure how to evaluate $\{on|on\}$ or $\{off|off\}$. I might however naively call these on^* & off^* .

I playfully would call these **projective** games.

Oh right.. the big kicker in all of this? \mathbb{D} is equal to the set of no numbers. That is:

$$\mathbb{D} = \{\}$$

#NES to the max 100

What I keep wondering is.. is \mathbb{D} "the" *master* idempotent?? 🤔 That which has the maximal *absorbing* nature (compared to let's say the *adsorbent* nature of the traditional empty set \emptyset).

In other news, after placing a bounty on a question about a multiplication *nimonic* (**nimber mnemonic**), I got an amazing answer! I initially randomly stumbled upon a simple multiplication nimonic after seeing 1 for addition. This led me to create a larger nimonic, which then led to trying to find the optimum configuration.

Enter **PG(3,2)**. There is a nice **3d graph** that I have been considering updating with labels for the given solution. I started playing around with three.js as well (peep the new **hypersurreal** homepage).

Need. Coffee. TTFN

~StarGirl 🧚‍♀️